

(B) Remarks

The allowance of claims 18, 23 - 29, and 31 is gratefully acknowledged. Claim 1, 17, and 19 as amended properly recite *angular* and overcome the objection. The indication that claims 3, 4 and 11 - 15 would be allowable if placed in independent form and include the limitations of any intervening dependent claim is also gratefully acknowledged. Claims 3, 5, and 23 are amended to correct obvious errors and claim 20 is amended to delete subject matter introduced in parent claim 19.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested to the merits of claims 1, 2, 5-10, 16, 17, and 19-21. Independent claims 1, 17, 19, and 21 are each amended to recite that the array of first, second and third triangular facades have peripheral walls between triangular walls as disclosed in Applicant's specification page 5, line 14 through page 8, line 1 and all of the drawings. It is clear from the Attachment A to the Official action that the Examiner is construing the Nelson reference for a teaching of three planar triangular facades comprised of a vertical end face and adjoining roof faces. This is not Applicant's construction. It is respectfully submitted that Nelson cannot be properly construed to teach or suggest three facades each having the three dimensional construction of triangular walls and peripheral walls and further that the recitation of the jutting structure is that of a peripheral wall and triangular walls.

Claim 19 is also rejected as anticipated by the Johnson '626 reference. It is submitted that the amended language in claim 19 serves also to patentably distinguishes over Johnson, namely:

"a second triangular building element of said three triangular building elements having said one boundary wall between two triangular walls forming an acute angular relation jutting from a junction of triangular walls of each of a first and a third of said three triangularly shaped building elements"

In the Johnson reference, the truncated tetrahedral shapes 49, 48 and 47 are arranged such that shapes 49 and 47 are structurally mutually exclusive and lie at opposite sides of shape 48. Thus, truncated tetrahedral shape 48 does not jut for a junction of truncated tetrahedral shapes 49 and 47.

Claims 30 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.35 § 103 as unpatentable over Nelson in view of Frucht. Reconsideration is respectfully requested based on the belief parent claims 1 and 21 are patentably distinguishable over Nelson for the reasons given supra and further that the combination of references requires improper hindsight use of applicant's invention.

Accordingly, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. In the event the Examiner believes a telephone interview will further the prosecution, she is invited to telephone the undersigned at 412-366-6200.

Respectfully submitted,



Clifford A. Poff
Registration No. 24,764
Agent for Applicants

CAPoff/lcl
Enclosure